



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,062	01/12/2001	Daniel S. Lipkin	360322000900	9816

20872 7590 02/02/2004  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 MARKET STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2482

EXAMINER

HUA, LY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2135

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

826

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/759,062

Applicant(s)

LIPKIN ET AL.

Examiner

Ly V. Hua

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4, 7. 6) ☐ Other: .

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The applicant is hereby informed that there are two forms PTO-1449 attached herewith. On the folder of the application, it is indicated that there are three Information Disclosure statements (i.e., paper numbers 4 (filed April 03, 2001), 5 (filed June 18, 2001) and 7 (filed August 04, 2003). Form PTO-1449 for paper number 7 is attached herewith. Form PTO-1449 (stamped December 31, 2001) attached herewith does not appear to be any of the paper numbers 4 and 5. Perhaps PTO-1449 (stamped December 31, 2001) attached herewith could be another Information Disclosure Statement not listed as the content of the case since the stamped date is not close to April 03, 2001 or June 18, 2001. Paper numbers 4 and 5 is listed on the jacket of the case, but they are missing. Applicant comment on this matter is needed. Perhaps the Applicant should verify whether PTO-1449 (stamped December 31, 2001) attached herewith is one of paper number 4s and 5. The applicant is to provide the examiner with any information disclosure statement and its form PTO-1449 that appears to be missing,

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Annevelink (5,448,727) in view of Martin et al (EP 0955761).

4. With regard to claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11:

- a. This claim claims a method which is:
  - i. for managing security on a business application management platform implemented on a computer, and
  - ii. comprising the steps of
    - (1) partitioning a plurality of business objects into a plurality of hierarchical domains; and
    - (2) creating a security list:
      - (a) which list is configured to grant a member the right to perform a security operation on said business object located in said hierarchical domain, and
      - (b) which creating is comprising the steps of

- (i) adding said security operation to said security list;
    - (ii) applying said security operation to one of said plurality of domains; and
    - (iii) adding said member to said security list.
  - b. Annevelink (5,448,727) teaches (see Annevelink's Abstract) a method which is comprising the steps of
    - i. partitioning a plurality of objects into a plurality of domains; and
    - ii. (inherently) creating a list (which is to contain the information for properly accessing and otherwise manipulating the data that a domain contains).
  - c. However, Annevelink does not explicitly teach:
    - i. that his method's inherently created a list to grant a member the right to perform a security operation on said business object located in said hierarchical domain, and
    - ii. that his inherent list is created by the steps of:
      - (1) adding said security operation to said security list;
      - (2) applying said security operation to one of said plurality of domains; and
      - (3) adding said member to said security list.
  - d. Martin et al (EP 0955761 A hereinafter Martin) teaches an access control list, (for use in controlling an access to a domain), formed with access control rights for different users/members and/or bodies. (See Martin's Abstract, page 3, lines 1-58.
  - e. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form a specific security list as that of Martin for Annevelink's partitioned objections in his domains.
  - f. The skilled person would have been motivated to do such forming because Martin teaches using such a list to securely control an access to his objects in his domains and because Annevelink teaches objects in domains which are to be properly accessed.
5. With regard to claims 2 and 4:
- a. Annevelink's partitioned<sub>business</sub> objects are grouped together in specific categories and/or classes.
  - b. Martin's security operation is performed on a category or class of business objects.
6. With regard to claim 3, Martin teaches a right to perform a security operation is shared by more than one member/users/bodies.
7. With regard to claim 10, Martin's security list is a global security list configured to apply across a plurality of hierarchical domains.
8. With regard to claims 12-32, The limitation in these claims 12-32 are similar to those in claims 1-11, and thus similarly lack an inventive step with the same reasons that have been applied to claims 1-11 above.
9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
10. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703)872-9306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 872-9306 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Ly Hua whose telephone number is (703) 305-9684. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Yen Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



LY V. HUA  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 2131

L. Hua  
January 20, 2004